

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re: Application of: Kojola et al.

Attorney Docket: 944-003.106

Serial No.: 09/954,619

Group Art Unit: 2643

Filed: September 17, 2001

Examiner: M. Ramakrishnaiah

For: **INTERNAL BROADCAST RECEPTION SYSTEM FOR MOBILE PHONES**

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Director of the United States Patent & Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RECEIVED

JUN 24 2004

Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE TO NON-FINAL OFFICE ACTION (Paper No.4)

Sir:

This responses to the Non-Final Office Action, mailed March 24, 2004.

In the patent application, claims 1-40 are pending. In the office action, claims 1-14, 19-23, 26, 28-33 and 35-40 are rejected and claims 15-18, 24, 25, 27 and 34 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

At section 2 of the office action, claims 1-5, 8, 10-11, 14, 19 21-22, 23, 26, 28-33 and 35-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lahti* (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,567).

In rejecting claims 1 and 23, the Examiner alleges that *Lahti* discloses an integrated broadcast reception system as claimed. The Examiner states that *Lahti* discloses a reception system comprising an electrically non-conductive substrate, an electrically conductive element disposed on the substrate and a signal processing module (304, 305 in Figure 6).

It is respectfully submitted that *Lahti* only discloses an antenna structure 309 comprising a substrate for disposing a radiating element 22 and a radiating parasitic element 23 on opposite sides of the substrate (see Figures 2 and 5a-5d). As depicted in Figure 6, the antenna structure 309 is separated from the transmission block 304 and the control unit 305.

In contrast, in the claimed invention, the signal processor is also disposed on the substrate.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 23 are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Lahti* reference.


At sections 3 to 7, all other rejected claims are rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lahti* in view of other secondary references. However, all other rejected claims are dependent from claims 1 and 23 and recite features not recited in claims 1 and 23. For reasons regarding claims 1 and 23 above, all other rejected dependent claims 2-14, 19-22, 26, 28-33 and 35-40 are also distinguishable over the cited references.

At section 8, claims 15-18, 24, 25, 27 and 35 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

CONCLUSION

All pending claims 1-40 are distinguishable over the cited references. Early allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

 June 17, 2004
Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955